DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 489 CG 021 622

AUTHOR Ronkowski, Shirley; Iannaccone, Laurence
TITLE Socialization Research in Administration, Graduate School, and Other Professions: The Heuristic Power of Van Gennep and Becker Models.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Medical Students; Models; *Professional Personnel; *Professional Training; *Socialization; Teacher Education; Theories

ABSTRACT

Ten socialization studies, all of which used Becker's model of perspective shift and/or Van Gennep's three-stage socialization framework were analyzed for common patterns that would add to the empirical and theoretical base of the Becker and Van Gennep models. The studies were concerned with experiences of adults entering and moving through educational administration, graduate school training, student teaching, nursing, and law enforcement. Empirical evidence was found to support Van Gennep's notion of the three stages of separation, transition, and incorporation occurring as phases within the transition stage when that stage takes place over a prolonged period of time. Using the concept of a three-phase sequence within the transition stage as a structure for deeper analysis of four of the 10 studies, three distinguishable patterns were found regarding the ways in which individuals locate themselves in the transition stage. The three patterns of self-location were: (1) comparison of one's self with others; (2) comparison of self, especially job related performance with role requirements; and (3) comparison of self with one's self in a temporal sense of past, present, and future. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306489

Socialization Research in Administration, Graduate School, and Other Professions: The Heuristic Power of Van Gennep and Becker Models

Shirley Ronkowski
Instructional Development
University of California, Santa Barbara

Laurence Iannaccone
Graduate School of Education
University of California, Santa Barbara

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco
1989

Running Head: Using Van Gennep and Becker Models

CS 021622

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Shirley Ronkowski
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper reports findings from a secondary analysis of ten studies, concerned with the socialization experiences of adults entering and moving through educational administration, graduate school training, student teaching, nursing, and law enforcement. Empirical evidence was found to support Van Gennep's notion of the of three stages of separation, transition, and incorporation occurring as phases within the transition stage when that stage takes place over a prolonged period of time. Using the concept of a three phase sequence within the transition stage as a structure for deeper analysis of four of the ten studies, three distinguishable patterns were found regarding the ways in which individuals locate themselves in the transition stage. The three patterns of self location were found to be: (1) comparison of one's self with others; (2) comparison of self especially job related performance with role requirements; and (3) comparison of self with one's self in a temporal sense of past, present, and future. The universality of these three comparison categories suggests their importance as evaluative criteria for people moving through career mobility check points and learning crises.

Further, these three self comparisons were found to be of varying degrees of importance at each phase of the transition stage. Concerns about and self comparisons with others was most prominent in the separation phase, concerns and comparisons based on task and role performance were emphasized in the transition phase, and comparisons between former and present self were of major importance during the incorporation phase. The general movement was from being defined by others to being self defined.

Introduction

This paper reports some of the findings of a study of studies. It reflects reanalyses of ten empirical studies of the adult socialization experiences of people in the fields of education, nursing, law enforcement, and graduate students in four of the social sciences. More specifically, five of these come from the world of professional education (Blood, 1966; Iannaccone & Button, 1964; Marshall, 1979: Mascaro, 1973; Valverde, 1974). Two of the studies reflect the socialization experiences during doctoral training, one in medicine (Ortiz, 1972) and one in the social sciences (Ronkowski, 1985). Another pair study professional training of police officers and role redefinition through promotion (Banks, 1987: Yunker, 1977) and one study reports on physician-nurse interactions as a function of professional training and experience (Wroblewski, 1987).

In passing, we note that while our study is not a minority education or equity study at bottom, its data bases draw most heavily on women and minority aspects of socialization into these careers: note in particular Iannaccone and Button, Marshall, Ortiz, Valverde, and Wroblewski. In essence we have used secondary analyses of open-ended qualitative studies on organizational socialization. These studies have at least three key elements in common.

> (1) They are focused on adult career or job socialization primarily in educational organizations and careers, often involving administration or management.
> (2) They used the sociological field study approach with combinations of participant observation, analyses of documents, and lengthy open-ended interviews. Most of these understandably relied heavily on self-report of people currently experiencing or recently having experienced the socialization process.
> (3) Most but not all explicitly made use of the Van Gennep and Becker models in reporting their findings. Thus there is some basic commonality in the frame of reference they used.

More specifically, most of the studies analyzed for this paper's synthesis used either of two conceptual frameworks or more often a combination of both. The frameworks are: (1) Arnold Van Gennep's three stages in his classic analyses of universal ceremonial rites of passage surrounding individual life crises, as well as the rituals surrounding territorial ingress and egress; and (2) Howard Becker's model from *Boys in White* (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961) explaining the dynamics of the shift from initial to more socialized career and work-related perspectives in the adult socialization process.

The Becker Model

Howard Becker's introduction of the perspective concept further reduced the gap that Merton (1968) had begun to fill between reference theory and individual experiences in the socialization process. Perspective, as the term is used by Becker, refers to an individual's perception of and corresponding plans of action for problematic situations. The encounter between initial perspectives and problematic situations involves perceived requirements of the organizational situation that produce cognitive dissonance which is resolved by the formation of a new, adjusted perspective.

Because perspectives shift, the socialization process is often experienced as upending (Schein, 1968) and such experiences are referred to as life crises. These crises can be thought of as developmental and accompanying certain life events such as marriage, death, and childbirth or simply occurring as stages in the growth and aging process (Gould, 1972; Levinson, 1974; Sheehy, 1974). The rites of passage, or rites of transition as Kimball calls them (Van Gennep, 1960, introduction), provides us with an understanding of the structure of life crises and secondary socialization situations that involve change in social status.

The Van Gennep Model

In studying the ceremonial rites of tribal societies, Van Gennep (1960) found that rites accompanying movement from one physical territory to another or movement from one social status to another occur in a common progression of three stages. First, there are rites of *separation* in which the individual physically or psychologically leaves his/her current social status. The next stage is a *transition* period in which the individual is given some special knowledge, must pass certain tests, or is in some way physically changed. In the final stage, the individual is *incorporated* into the new status by some public symbolic or change.

This simple framework of separation, transition, and incorporation has been used in rather diverse ways in the social sciences; including use with such topics as the process of childbirth (Jones & Dougherty, 1982), father and son conflicts (Murphy, 1984), middle management (Schrier & Mulcahy, 1988), understanding the psychotherapy process (Siggins, 1983; White, 1986), elementary teacher socialization (Eddy, 1969), and postsecondary education (Kuh & Whitt, 1988).

Purpose of Study

The focus of the present paper is not on the range of use of the Becker or Van Gennep frameworks nor is it an evaluation of their utility. Instead, this paper reports common and differentiating findings from the studies noted earlier, primarily unpublished doctoral dissertations concerned with the socialization experiences of adults entering and moving through educational administration, graduate school training, student teaching, nursing, and law enforcement. The findings examined for this paper include especially: (1) areas of concern and anxiety (e.g., redefinition of self, appropriate response within the situation, organizational role behavior, and personal and professional self identity; (2) redefinition and repositioning of one's self in a number of relationships ranging from intimate to purely professional ones; and (3) the changing predominance of significant others, criteria of perceived success, and sources of performance evidence for these criteria. Speaking methodologically, we began with the foci or lenses indicated by the three general categories noted immediately above.

Data Analysis

As researchers accustomed to using open-ended sociological field methods or anthropological studies know all too well, deferring analyses until substantial amounts of data are in hand leads to a disaster. With ten rather detailed studies in hand, most of them rich with excerpts of quotations from informant sources, we decided to delimit the task further by beginning our reanalysis with four of the ten.

Thus, our initial systematic secondary analysis was made of four studies having to do with the socialization experiences of various populations within the field of education: student teachers (Iannaccone & Button, 1964), first year graduate students (Ronkowski, 1985), female administrators (Marshall, 1979), and first and second year school administrators (Blood, 1966). These studies were chosen from among the ten for two reasons; first, they all dealt with socialization within the field of education and second, each study used populations that were in the transition stage of socialization as that stage is described by Van Gennep (1960). More specifically, these studies evidenced, to varying degrees, the *three phases* within the *transition stage*. That is, Van Gennep felt that the rituals of transition tended themselves to reflect the larger three stages: separation, transition, and incorporation, as he discovered them surrounding the universal life crises and the rituals within which he found passages of ingress and egress.

In the earliest work in our set of ten studies, student teaching is viewed as a transition stage in the larger movement from college student to teacher. Thus, given the warrant by Van Gennep and the analysis used in the earliest of our set of studies, it seemed to us reasonable to begin our systematic reanalyses with the four studies which clearly focused upon (1) the

transitional stage in career mobility and socialization; and (2) had viewed this stage as internally dividible into three phases in terms of Van Gennep's larger three conceptual stages: separation, transition, and incorporation. Thus, the use of Van Gennep's framework guided our initial selection of ten studies to be examined by us (although we did not completely restrict ourselves by this criterion). The fact that all the studies, implicitly if not explicitly, used the same conceptual frame of reference played a more important part in our selection of the first four studies for our reanalyses.

Taking a lead from the typical three step sequence in sociological field work method, we were at this point in our work moving from first days in the field to the most time consuming second step of saturating our categories and refining them. The Van Gennep framework had been used as described above. The Becker model was viewed by us, and in those studies among our chosen ten, as providing a sharper focus within the larger context of organizational socialization. It helped to zoom in on the socialization crises in confronting the organizational contexts of the ten studies. But, while useful to guide us to this point, it was not pointed enough for our specific questions, although, as indicated previously, Van Gennep's three stage concept used as phases within the transitional stage was very helpful.

The general question posed by our secondary analysis of the initial four studies was the question of how people locate themselves while in the transition stage. That is, how do they judge their progress—how do they decide how well they are progressing toward being incorporated into the desired membership group? It was clear that peers stood out as important locaters for people in the separation phase of the transition stage. The researchers wondered if there were particular locaters prominent at each phase within this transition stage. In order to systematize the analysis of the data presented by these four studies, a separate method was devised for each study whereby the data could be categorized into separation, transition, and incorporation phase data (see Appendix A). It is therefore necessary to discuss each study separately in terms of how the data were analyzed.

The study carried out by Ronald Blood (1966) was concerned with the function and dysfunctions of the teaching experience as socialization for the role of school principal. The questions he posed required first and second year principals to remember back to their experiences as teachers and administrative candidates and, therefore, elicited data most appropriate to the separation phase of transition. For analysis, comments made by the subjects were classified according to the time period to which they spoke. The time periods in which the subjects were occupying the teacher role, administration candidate role, and new principal role were taken to correspond to the separation, transition, and incorporation phases respectively. Data in the second and third time period were scant and are so reflected in the results of the secondary analysis (see Appendix B, Tables 1B-3B).

Iannaccone and Button's (1964) study provided rich data on the experiences of student teachers. The majority of data were taken from the

personal journals of student teachers which were written over the period of 13 weeks as an assignment during their practice teaching. For the purposes of this secondary analysis, comments made by the subjects during their first to fourth weeks, fourth to ninth, and tenth to thirteenth weeks of student teaching were considered parallel to the separation, transition, and incorporation phases, respectively.

Marshall interviewed 25 female administrators with varying amounts of administrative experience. Her purpose was to discover what factors facilitate or hinder women in their career development as administrators. She did not begin with the primary goal of examining the socialization side of the experiences, yet, the responses of her subjects moved her there. In her results she indicates three phases that women transit as they enter administrative roles. First, the women tend to be culturally defined, then pass through a transition phase, and finally become self defined as opposed to culturally defined. In the secondary analysis reported here, these three categories of experience were considered to be the three phases of the transition stage.

Ronkowski (1985) interviewed first year doctoral students for the purpose of identifying factors that enhanced or hindered students' adaption to their first year of graduate studies. In the data analysis, students were placed into three categories; easy, moderate, and difficulty of adaption. Findings in that study indicated that these categories of adaption corresponded to the three phases within the transition stage and were used as such in the secondary analysis reported in the present paper.

The remaining six studies were analyzed individually and are used in this paper to exemplify and support the various findings in the initial four studies.

Results: Three Phases Within the Transition Stage

As indicated earlier in this paper, Iannaccone and Button (1964) found evidence of Van Gennep's suggestion that separation, transition, and incorporation *phases* occur within the transitional stage. Ronkowski's (1985) study of graduate student socialization and Bank's (1987) study of police mobility lend further empirical support to this expanded view of the transition stage. To exemplify what we mean by phases within stages, we present the following three comments by police personnel. Note how the sergeant position, first step in the upward mobility from patrolman, is described. All comments point to the separation phase of this, the first step in the transition from patrol officer to management.

> Detective: 'As a sergeant you are really removed from the (patrol) work. Sergeant—as an example, has to stay separate. He stays involved, but he always stays a bit aloof because he has to take a look at it from a different perspective' (Banks, p. 100).

> Sergeant: 'in one word...interpreter. Word or orders come down from up above and we have to pass it on to the other personne...[sic] the troops. Generally I have to take orders and give them, usually more of the first. So I don't feel like I am a real part of the management. But I do feel a responsibility to those people, and to the people I supervise. I am probably right in between' (p.99).
>
> Captain: 'As a sergeant you start stepping into the management ranks. The first big thing that happens as a sergeant is that you feel somewhat different than the average police officer, in that he can't do exactly the same as they can do. And I think that you are no longer 'one of the boys' (p. 100)

The statements of these three respondents agree; the sergeant role is a first step in the mobility system from patrol officer to management. They all also say that separation is a major, if not the major aspect of that first step: note, "...no longer one of the boys' and 'I don't feel part of...probably right in between' and '...really removed from...always stays a bit aloof...' Clearly, a separation phase in the transition stage is present. It is also clear in the sergeant's words that the comparison base of the implicit evaluative criterion used is firstly the relationship to others, in this instance both above and below in rank.

Further, when these statements are analyzed from another level, they can be seen to exemplify the shift in perception that takes place as the officers move up the ranks of the police force. The detective, who has not yet achieved the rank of sergeant and has not separated from the role of officer, emphasizes the *separation* aspect of the sergeant's position. That is, the sergeant is no longer one of the patrol officers. He '...has to stay separate' and '...take a different perspective'. But the sergeant, who is in the transitional role between patrol officer and management, emphasizes the *transition* aspects of the job—'I am probably right in between'. The captain, who has previous held the sergeant role but is now *incorporated* into management, focuses on the nearness to management of the sergeant role; '...you start stepping into the management ranks'. Hence, the three phases within transition are evidenced not only in the role of sergeant and the descriptions of that role but are also exemplified in the perspectives of the three officer ranks.

Results: Locating One's Self In Transition

Three distinguishable patterns for locating one's self in the transitional socializations experienced were reported in each of the initial four studies analyzed. In passing, the same patterns appear in the additional six studies as these were subsequently examined. Each of the three patterns is composed of

the same three primary concepts. We say primary concepts because there are others but the others appear either as correlates of the three primary ones or in a few instances but not universally in the ten studies. These primary concepts appear to us to be best labeled as : (1) comparison of one's self with others; (2) comparison of self especially job related performance with the role requirements; and (3) comparison of self with one's self in a temporal sense of past, present, and future. The universality of these three comparison categories suggests their importance as evaluative criteria for people moving through career mobility check points and learning crises. They seem to function as basic dimensions within which the individual asks— of others, of the task, and of one's self—'How am I doing?'

Yunker's (1977) study of the police probes (trainees) provides examples of the perspective shifts that are made in self comparisons as an individual moves through the phases of the transition stage. We present the reader with three comments typifying these shifts. The first comment was made by a police probe who describes a field training instructor and suggests the importance of how others evaluate him.

> Hal is great; he doesn't bull-shit you. He tells it to you straight" (Yunker, p.53).

The probe values the honest feedback from the instructor using it as a signpost to answer the question 'How am I doing?' The emphasis here is on answering that question from the feedback of others or in some way measuring self via other people.

Now note the issue of competence (i.e., task or role performance as signpost) in this next statement in which a police officer responds to the shooting death of one officer and the wounding of another.

> They [the murdered and wounded policemen] got caught with their pants down. They didn't handle it right; they let that man get out of their sight (Yunker, p. 64).

The emphasis here is on the competence of the officers and how well they fulfilled their role. Such a comment regarding performance is a second way in which people locate themselves in the transition stage and determine how well they are doing.

Finally, take as an example of self as the criterion, a statement made by a police officer six months after completing the field training.

> I've changed my attitude about the way you handle some people. I've become a little more hard-nosed (Yunker, p. 59).

This comparison of previous to present self is commonly made by individuals late in the transition phase; they tend to note changes regarding themselves, their attitudes, interests, behaviors, and abilities.

This particular sequence of shift in self comparisons—comparisons with others, task, and self—was first found in the four studies we initially analyzed and subsequently found in the other six. Further, these self comparisons show a pattern; self-other concerns are the major concerns during the separation phase of the transition stage, role ability concerns are dominant during the transition phase, and self comparisons (past vs. present perceptions of self) are dominant in the incorporation phase as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Pattern of Self Comparisons Within the Transition Stage

Separation Phase	Transition Phase	Incorporation Phase
1. others	1. task/role	1. self
2. self	2. others	2. task/role
3. task/role	3. self	3. others

While all three types of comparisons are evidenced within each phase, the importance of each type, varies by phase. Generally, the importance of measuring self via comparing self with others or looking to the judgement of others steadily declines as the individual moves through the transition stage while task and then self comparisons increase in their importance. In varying ways, three of the other six studies substantiate this key finding: the Valverde, Wroblewski, and Ortiz studies.

Because Valverde's (1974) study was concerned with the sponsor role in the socialization of educational administrators, his data regarding the administrative candidate's socialization experiences are limited. He was primarily concerned with the opportunities for minority, women, or people who are in some way different from sponsors, and so his major attention was on the initial phase of transition. Indeed his primarily focus is on recruitment, almost above socialization. Consequently, Valverde does not help us much with transition and incorporation phases but does help with the separation phase. In that connection, his evidence is overwhelmingly supportive of the primacy of others in that first (separation) phase.

Unlike Valverde, Wroblewski's (1987) subjects were experienced nurses and were interviewed and observed well after their initial socialization period. Her emphasis was on the norms and practices that reverse the usual professional roles in the interaction between physicians and nurses. Since her subjects were well incorporated within their profession, her major contribution, from our point of view, consists of a demonstration that a combination of professional competence, occupying the formal roles appropriate to those skills, and professional self-definition (similar to the Ortiz

and Marshall concepts of self-definition to be described later) led to success in reversing authority roles in the doctor-nurse interaction when the situations were perceived by the nurses to require it.

Ortiz (1972) found three sorts of expectations among her subjects: women in medical training. These were identified and described by her as "a role-breaker in surgery, a role-taker in pediatrics, and a role-taker with role-breaker expectations in the Outpatient Clinic..." (p.90). Each of these types of expectations, to a degree, reflect variations similar to Van Gennep's triad. The role-taker was clearly least separated from traditional women's roles with the role-breaker furthest from the tradition definitions of women's roles and in fact was the most self defined of the three women. Marshall's (1979) major descriptive dimension for her 25 subjects is similarly anchored in traditional vs. self-defined role definitions and movement from an other-defined sense of self to a self-defined sense of self.

The studies just discussed support, in general terms, the movement from others, to task, to self as an individual seeks to locate him/herself in the transition stage of the socialization process. The following more specific data have been excerpted from the four studies used in our early analysis and are presented to help readers understand the sort of data which on the one hand helped us refine our categories and on the other hand operated in the process field study methodologists often refer to as saturating the categories.

Each of the following excerpts have been placed within the three phases of separation, transition and incorporation, as illustrative of the data used as the empirical bases and operational definitions of each phase. They may also serve to illustrate the three dimensions cutting across the phases: others, task, and self.

Separation phase: self comparisons with others

Graduate Student:

> People, even friends of mine, girl friends, are kind of like, 'Well, you're a grad student now. You're a big deal and you're no longer with us, in the same boat...You're somebody special (Ronkowski, 1985, p.110).

Student Teacher Remark:

> I thought I was ahead of the others. Now I find I'm behind. They've all done some teaching...(Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 38).

Administrator:

> I'm not that far away from teachers, not yet...I have not divorced myself enough from teachers...I'm quite sure this attitude will change as the years go by, but right now I'm still more teacher than principal...(Blood, 1966, p. 98).

Graduate Student:

> You're sitting there [talking with faculty] going, my god, its like talking to a movie star...It's really strange to move up the ladder. I think for me it was a difficult adjustment...(Ronkowski, 1985, p.112).

Please note the prominence of others in the quotations characteristic of the separation phase. In the first two comments, the previous reference group dominates the concern expressed, a peer comparison is emphasized in the third and a member of the group toward which the individual being socialized aspires is the focus of the fourth statement.

Transition phase: self comparisons with the task/role

Graduate Student:

> I just know the system better so I know how to allocate my time I think more efficiently...I have a better sense of what they expect of me and I know some of the professors...(Ronkowski, 1985, p. 138).

Administrator:

> I had difficulty asserting myself on the teacher committee. Finally, I came to the conclusion that this isn't a democracy; I know more than they do, and it's my decision to make (Marshall, 1979, p. 131).

Administrator:

> It was hard to convince the other Vice Principals and the Principal that I could do administrative duties; they'd been working together a long time. They saw me as an assistant; I had to fight for areas that were mine (Marshall, 1979,130).

While self comparison with others is important in the quotations we found subsequently within the transition phase, note the task overlay in each case. The comments suggest that the individual is learning more about the system, becoming better skilled, and learning how to handle problematic situations and developing new role perspectives.

Incorporation phase: self comparisons with former self

Researcher Comment About Women Administrators:

> Women become comfortable with being marginal women in a less negative way when they form collegial support groups with other marginal women...developing [an] old girl's network (Marshall, 1979, p. 199)

Graduate Student:

> I guess it's must maybe that I've been in school for so long by this point, I guess I consider myself a sort of colleague with some of the professors. So I guess my own perception of my status has changed.

Student Teacher:

> As far as Alice's log goes, on this her last night in the school, she perceived herself as part of a teaching team, a junior partner if not equal to Miss Adams (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 43).

The evidence of the incorporation emphasis supports the self comparison of that phase. Each comment suggests that the relationship with or perception of self has changed.

Self comparisons are of primary importance in both the incorporation *phase* of transition and the incorporation *stage* of socialization. Mascaro's (1973) study of the on-the-job learning of elementary school principals provides an illustration of how, at the incorporation stage—the subject is already a principal albeit in the first year—the individual uses the self over time as the primary criterion variable while also including some self comparisons related to others and to task.

> I'm not that far from teachers, not yet...I have not divorced myself enough from teachers that I can sit [at a district staff meeting] and let staff—by staff I mean the administrative hierarchy—I can't sit there and have them say, 'Teachers can do this on their own time,' and not react...I'm quite sure this attitude will change as the years go by, but right now I'm still more teacher than principal...(Mascaro, p. 98).

This statement includes several of the elements just discussed. It takes place early in the incorporation stage of the principalship, after transition. However, as the Van Gennep study of ceremonies indicates, trace elements of separation still appear. Psychologically, the projection is clearly, transitional. In effect the statement is, "I am not who or what I was, but I am not who I will be." It displays elements of concern over the views of others as a basis for evaluation and the principal task/role. But above all and most wistfully it says, "As I compare my present professional self with my previous professional self, I know I'm divorced from that but not as much as I will be when I've become professionally who I'm on the way of becoming." Finally, the combination of these elements across the Van Gennep three phase frame of reference and resting on the three dimensions of other, task, and self as here stated displays the interdependence of the nine cells in Appendix B.

Appendix B provides many more of the statements which appeared in the original four studies. These have been classified (as may be seen in Appendix B, Tables B1-3) using more categories than the three dimensions of others, task, and self. The additional categories and classifications are omitted from this paper's main discussion for three reasons; (1) feasibility of length, (2) some appear to be subcategories as indicated in their placement under the three key dimensions, and (3) they appear less frequently in the other six studies.

There is a fourth reason we have not given these attention in this paper and have similarly neglected several other related findings. We did not and do not wish to stray too far from the basic findings. Otherwise, for example, we might have given attention to Mascaro's (1973) elaboration or extension of Becker's conceptual system. Mascaro makes a the distinction between "outlook", which he defines as the concept or view of the principal's role based on occupational socialization and the term "perspective"which Becker defines as '...a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation...' (Mascaro, p.4).

According to Mascaro's findings, administrative experience at any organizational level (i.e., district level, elementary, secondary, junior high) can lead to adoption of an administrative outlook. However in his study, only administrative experience at the elementary level led to elementary principals having adopted role perspectives appropriate for the principalship. Those with administrative experience other than in elementary schools came in with the principal outlook but encountered problematic situations which required them to adopt more specific role perspectives appropriate to the elementary school level of principalship. Thus, Mascaro moves us toward a tighter operational definition of Becker's concept.

Summary

In sum, ten socialization studies all of which used Becker's model of perspective shift and/or Van Gennep's three stage socialization framework were analyzed for common patterns that would add to the empirical and theoretical base of the Becker and Van Gennep models. Two major themes that were found in this secondary analysis were discussed in the present paper. First, five of the studies (Banks, 1987; Iannaccone & Button, 1964; Marshall, 1979; Ronkowski, 1985; Yunker, 1977) clearly provide empirical evidence to support Van Gennep's notion of the of three stages of separation, transition, and incorporation occurring as phases within the transition stage when that stage takes place over a prolonged period of time as in the case of professional socialization examined in these studies.

Using the concept of a three phase sequence within the transition stage as a structure for deeper analysis of four of the ten studies, we found three distinguishable patterns of how individuals locate and assess themselves in this transition stage. The three patterns of self location were found to be:

(1) comparison of one's self with others; (2) comparison of self especially job related performance with the role requirements; and (3) comparison of self with one's self in a temporal sense of past, present, and future. The universality of these three comparison categories suggests their importance as evaluative criteria for people moving through career mobility check points and learning crises.

Further, these three self comparisons were found to be of varying degrees of importance at each phase of the transition stage. Concerns about and self comparisons with others was most prominent in the separation phase, concerns and comparisons based on task and role performance were emphasized in the transition phase, and comparisons between former and present self were of major importance during the incorporation phase. The general movement from self identity being defined by others to self identity being self defined is a progression from reliance on external to internal definitions. This movement is of particular salience for minorities and women in that, for them, redefinition and self definition of the professional identities may require simultaneous redefinition and, more specifically self definition of cultural and gender roles and identities. An interactional or ecological model serves here to make the point; a change in professional identity affects a change in other, more personal identities—identities which, for mainstream individuals, have traditionally remained stable and supportive to the shifts in professional identity being made during the socialization process. This stability would seem to be absent for minorities and women. The present paper's findings regarding the ways in which the self is reexamined and located during the transition stage of socialization may lead to a clearer idea of the workings of self redefinition in professional socialization and have implications for facilitating this process.

In closing

The contribution to future research of this study rests largely upon the theoretical synthesis of the Van Gennep and Becker conceptual frames of reference as calibrated through our reanalyses for different subject groups in specifically different organizational role socialization experiences. As may be clear from the report here presented, at least three types of public or professional service areas have provided data bases for this study. These are studies in education, nursing, and police. Most, but not all of the ones we have used to date involve organizational upward mobility, i.e., movement into managerial responsibilities. The utility of a tested conceptual framework in guiding future research designs and theoretical approaches to design and analyses should result.

In educational terms the results should improve our capacity to critique present professional or organizational socialization programs and experiences so as to reduce their inefficiencies, inconsistencies and inappropriate features.

Conversely, this study's results should facilitate the development of better adult socialization programs for careers and managerial jobs especially. Further, we now have evidence that the upward mobility function of the graduate school in educational administration is much more powerful for women and minorities than for mon-minority males. The synthesis of these sociological and anthropological studies could allow graduate programs to strengthen that function even more.

While we not not offer this as paragon, one example of what could be done may be seen in the Confluent Education program at the University of California, Santa Barbara in which we have both taught. Reflecting in part on some of these studies, we began some years ago to offer a first quarter course on organizational socialization. The course uses research readings and is theoretically guided. However, it also makes considerable use of hands on experiential activities. These capitalize upon the simple fact that our students, especially in the first quarter, tend to be experiencing separation as they enter the transitional stage on the way to professional specialization or management. Many other suggestions can be made but in essence, the results of this study suggest to us above all else, that university graduate programs in professional schools ought not to abandon or need to introduce, perhaps reintroduce, research-based experiential components in their programs.

Appendix A

Examples of Identifiers For Phases Within Transition

Separation Phase of Transition:

Comments regarding the following: societal norms, reference group, peers cohorts, significant others, expectations vs. realities, external conflicts, personal evaluation by others perceived as taking place, internal conflicts, meeting own goals or not, choices made, great social distance felt between self and superordinates, narrow distance felt between self and subordinates, uncertain self identity, still figuring out what to do and how to do it.

Transition Phase of Transition:

Comments regarding the following: sense of situation finally becoming manageable, making sense of situation, trying to determine what the rules are, sense of gaining skills or knowledge, strategies for solving problematic situations increasing, redefinition of the situation, learning the system, noticed changes in understanding of the role requirements, evaluation of performance taking place by self and/or others, social distance between self and subordinates widening, social distance between self and superordinates narrowing, GASing, empathy with superordinates, changes in perspective identified, alienation from former referent group.

Incorporation Phase of Transition:

Comments regarding the following: knowledge of the system, symbols of incorporation, superordinates nearly as peers, external feedback taken as symbol of incorporation nearing, self-reliance felt, sense of strength, increased positive self image, self-role congruence, reduction in anxiety, new perspective not only developed by highly valued, redefinition of self, new referent group acknowledged.

Appendix B

EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS FOR CATEGORIES AND SUBCATEGORIES OF SELF COMPARISONS

Table B1

Separation Phase Of Transition Stage

	Graduate Students	Female Administrators	Student Teachers	New Administrators
OTHERS				
Societal Norms	X	X		X
Previous Reference Groups	X	X	X	X
Significant Others	X	X		
Peers & Cohort	X	X	X	
Superiors at great distance	X		X	
Subordinates at short distance		X		
TASK /ROLE				
Expectations vs. Reality	X	X	X	
External Feedback	X	X	X	X
Reassessment of Situation	X	X		X
SELF				
Internal Conflict	X	X	X	
Self Reexamination	X	X		X

Examples of Self Comparisons Within Separation Phase

Societal Norms

Graduate Student:

> Other times I feel like I don't want to admit to people that I meet at the beach or a bar that I'm getting my doctorate...a lot of times men...don't feel they can relate to a woman who's half way through her doctorate... (Ronkowski, 1985, p.196).

Administrator:

> I'm not that far away from teachers, not yet...I have not divorced myself enough from teachers...I'm quite sure this attitude will change as the years go by, but right now I'm still more teacher than principal...(Blood, 1966, p. 98).

Previous Reference Group

Graduate Student:

> People, even friends of mine, girl friends, are kind of like, 'Well, you're a grad student now. You're a big deal and you're no longer with us, in the same boat...You're somebody special (Ronkowski, 1985, p.110).

Administrator:

The hardest decision for me was whether I wanted to go into administration, whether I wanted to put on that hat. To get into the management bag was a hard decision. Am I deserting my friends, am I going to run around being negative, the bad guy? (Marshall,1979, p. 64-65).

Significant Others

Administrator:

> The turning point for me was when I said I wanted to quit work to go back to school and my husband said 'fine!' It makes all the difference in the world as to whether a woman can finish her degree if her husband helps (Marshall, 1979, p. 56).

Graduate Student:

> Being female probably has a lot to do with it When I was younger, in high school, I hated getting A's —when you're a girl—because guys wouldn't ask you out because you were too smart...Sometimes you feel like, 'Do I want to be this? Do I want to be different?'...a lot of the men...I mean, I think that's what's happening with the guy that I've been seeing (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 113).

Cohort & Peers

Student Teacher Remark:

> I thought I was ahead of the others. Now I find I'm behind. They've all done some teaching...(Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 38).

Graduate Student Remark:

> And these people I think have much more of what it takes to get through than I have. They seem to have the perseverance and the dedication and the desire to really work (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 210).

Superordinates at large distance

Graduate Student:

> You're sitting there [talking with faculty] going, my god, its like talking to a movie star...It's really strange to move up the ladder. I think for me it was a difficult adjustment...(Ronkowski, 1985, p.112).

Researcher remark in reference to student teachers:

> The relationship between the participants in the dyadic interaction set does not remain constant. Specifically, the social distance between the superordinate and subordinate members decreases [with the movement from separation to incorporation]. (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 43).

Subordinates at short distance

Administrator:

> It's very difficult to work out my relations with the women secretaries. It's hard to tell them to do some menial job that I'm refusing to do. I have to keep reminding myself what I'm paid for...(Marshall, 1979, p. 63).

Expectations vs. Reality

Graduate Student:

My biggest fear of coming out here was, 'God, can I handle it intellectually...And my biggest difficulty has not been the school work. My biggest difficulty has just been adjusting to the type of people and the type of system. (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 118).

External Feedback

Student Teacher:

> I began my unit on forests today...Nina seemed pleased and said I did a great job—I was on cloud 9 (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 55).

Graduate Student:

> I can go from getting an A that was difficult...and one class I failed completely (Ronkowski, 1985, p.122).

Reassessment of Situation

Graduate Student:

> ...I mean I say this to myself but I ask, 'Is this true that I'm getting somewhere, that I'm doing something that I want to do?'(Ronkowski, 1985, p.120).

Administrator:

> Whenever a problem would occur—playground—I'd think what would I do? Had more empathy for him and his job (Blood, 1966, p.24).

Seeking Situational and Role Definitions

Graduate Student:

> I mean, a lot of the hurdles I have to overcome are not academic hurdles, they're not grasping something. It's getting somebody to sit on your committee or trying to psych out what is really expected of me. That sort of thing. I spend a lot of time doing that (Ronkowski, 1985, p.122).

Administrator:

> In my last year of teaching my mind began to change—I was still a teacher but 'What would I do in this case?' Would talk with the principal—we had a good relationship—could discuss things with him (Blood, 1966, p. 23).

Internal Conflict

Graduate Students:

> ...I have self doubts about my capabilities...(Ronkowski, 1985, p. 109).
> ...you're kind of torn between—I mean part of you wants to go out to a bar and go dancing and pretend that you're a freshman again...(Ronkowski, 1985, p. 112).

Administrator:

> When I started teaching I came under a lot of criticism from my friends who said it was unfair to start work when my family wasn't completely raised...(Marshall,1979,p. 46).

Self Reexamination

Graduate Student:

> I need to explore that and to realize that some of my ideas are not clearly articulated in my own head...(Ronkowski, 1985, p. 126).

Table B2

Transition Phase Of Transition Stage

	Graduate Students	Female Administrators	Student Teachers	New Administrators
TASK/ROLE				
Gaining Skills	X	X	X	
Learning the System	X	X	X	X
Strategies for Problematic Situations	X	X	X	X
External Feedback on task	X	X	X	
OTHERS				
Peer Comparisons	X	X		
GASing	X	X		X
Social Distance of Superiors Lessens	X	X	X	X
SELF:				
Internal Conflicts lessen	X	X	X	
Entrance into a New Reference Group	X	X	X	X

Examples of Self Comparisons Within Transition Phase

Gaining Skills

Graduate Student:

> The first quarter it seemed that I just was struggling just to stay even...now I just try to mentally separate the work, I mean, I have to do this tonight, I have to do this tomorrow, I should be doing this now. You see, it's kind of a mental filing system that I have (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 139).

Student Teacher:

> My weak point in the lesson was the spelling bee...Several pupils tried to change the rules...I made several changes in procedures (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 51).

Strategies for Problematic Situations

Administrator:

> When teaching—more or less concerned with the small group—in administration it's different...In administration you have to look at everything...(Blood, 1966, p. 35).

Researcher Comment About Student Teacher:

> ...on Thursday of her sixth week Alice wrote, 'Today I shook John Hudgins myself! (I had to, I see the point now!) '...On Monday of that week she had written, 'Miss Adams shook John Hudgins today. I was horrified' (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p.54).

Learning the System

Graduate Student:

> I just know the system better so I know how to allocate my time I think more efficiently...I have a better sense of what they expect of me and I know some of the professors...(Ronkowski, 1985, p. 138).

Administrator:

I had difficlty asserting myself on the teacher committee. Finally, I came to the conclusion that this isn't a democracy; I know more than they do, and it's my decision to make (Marshall, 1979, p. 131).

Administrator:

He (the principal) talked about his experience—different aspects of his job. I would pose different problems—he to me—budget... (Blood, 1966, p. 40).

External Feedback

Graduate Student:

An indicator of that was that I don't have any B's on my transcript, the professors talk to me in the hallway...[professor x] is still willing to work with me...so academically I'd say I'm doing well (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 146).

Student Teacher:

I asked my cooperating teacher for criticisms, I received two helpful suggestions (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p.50).

Internal Feedback

Administrator:

I know many women who cannot resolve the personal issues; you can't get anywhere until you've got that settled. Feeling good about myself was necessary. Anger gets in the way of doing a job well (Marshall, 1979, p.186). Student Teacher:
In general, I felt pretty good about the whole day. I felt in control of the situation...(Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 68).

Continued Peer Comparisons

Graduate Student:

It's like playing a sport where you'.re playing much better players. You get better than playing against inferior players. The same here (Ronkowski, 1985, p.137).

Administrator:

It was hard to convince the other Vice Principals and the Principal that I could do administrative duties; they'd been working together a long time. They saw me as an assistant; I had to fight for areas that were mine (Marshall, 1979, p. 130).

GASing

Researcher Comment About Administrators:

The candidates in the GASing pattern are engaging in activities which more resemble those of the administrator than the teacher (Blood, 1966, p. 40).

Administrator:

When the new principal first came he went by the book...I introduced him to the PTA—took over everything for several months. He gave me the opportunity to do a lot of things. We'd go out on weekends—[field] trips, with the kids...Blood, 1966 p. 37).

Graduate Student:

...the fact that classes are small enough where you can also get to know the instructor (Ronkowski, 1985, p.199).

Distance from superiors lessens

Graduate Students:

> I'm going to start working with a professor I happen to be TAing for this quarter...I'm having fun (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 199).
> I feel like I've been taken into the inner circle, if you will, of older graduate students (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 200).

Administrator:

> We had a superintendent who was very interested in me as a person; he always encouraged me to go on, learn new things...when new jobs came up...he always suggested that I fill them...(Marshall, 1979, p. 172).

Entrance into a New Reference Group

Graduate Student:

> ...I feel more legitimate. I feel there's a slight status difference between being an undergraduate and being a graduate student. And I like that (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 96).

Administrator:

> He brought me in to many of his [principal's] activities...(Blood, 1966, p. 40).

Table B3

Incorporation Phase Of Transition Stage

	Graduate Students	Female Administrators	Student Teachers	New Administrators
SELF				
Self Definition of Task/Role	X	X	X	X
Redefinition of Self	X	X	X	
Internal Conflicts Resolved	X	X	X	X
TASK/ROLE				
Positive External Feedback on Task	X	X	X	
Aware of & Value New Perspective	X	X	X	X
OTHERS				
Superordinates Nearly As Peers	X		X	X

Examples Of Self Comparisons Within Incorporation Phase

Self-Definition of Task/Role

Graduate Student:

> I guess I've discovered that the written rules don't always hold...and now I've discovered that if you just sort of seem forceful and everything else is going along OK, those kinds of things can be changed (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 102).

Researcher Comment About Women Administrators:

> Women become comfortable with being marginal women in a less negative way when they form collegial support groups with other marginal women...developing [an] old girl's network (Marshall, 1979, p. 199)

Redefinition of Self

Graduate Students:

> Maybe because I'm a little bit older it's important to me...As a 29 year old female without a husband or children or a house or a dog, it's much more legitimate to say that you're a graduate student (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 96).

Researcher Comment About Administrators:

> Others [women who overcome organizational roadblocks] find enough transition facilitators to enable them to move creatively through transition toward self-definition (Marshall, 1979, p. 203).

Internal Conflicts Resolved

> Note: Comments about internal conflicts were not found in the data from those people who had moved into the incorporation phase of the transition stage.

Graduate Student:

> Because now I'm finally in high gear...now I'm realizing that yes, this is my education, this is what I want to do. I'm glad I'm here so let's do it. And you

know, all these opportunities are there if I'm willing to take them (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 99).

Student Teacher:

I was beginning to feel rather secure in a routine...(Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 63).

Positive External Feedback

Graduate Student:

I have an advisor who's been extremely good with me, very supportive, very rewarding...making all these nice statements...(Ronkowski, 1985, p. 89).

Researcher Comment About a Student Teacher:

In the second half of the semester Alice felt free enough to...'suggest we use the gym' and they did (Iannaccone & Button, 1974, p. 44).

Aware of and Value New Perspective

Graduate Student:

The first time I was really just a graduate student; paid attention, listened...I did what I was supposed to etcetera. And I've kind of become more self-sufficient each place I go (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 101).

Student Teacher:

> It is easier to be tolerant as a student teacher for one semester than to have to deal with certain behavior problems as a full-time teacher all year. I wonder how much less tolerant I will become when this [latter] is my role...(Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 51).

Superordinates Nearly As Peers

Graduate Student:

> I guess it's just maybe that I've been in school for so long by this point, I guess I consider myself a sort of colleague with some of the professors. So I guess my own perception of my status has changed (Ronkowski, 1985, p. 102).

Student Teacher:

> As far as Alice's log goes, on this her last night in the school, she perceived herself as part of a teaching team, a junior partner if not equal to Miss Adams (Iannaccone & Button, 1964, p. 43).

References

Banks, T. R. (1987). *The dual nature of upward career mobility: An exploration into promotional dynamics in the Santa Barbara City Police Department.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E. C., & Strauss, A. L. (1961). *Boys in white: Student culture in medical school.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Blood, R. E., (1966). *Function of experience in professional preparation: Teaching and the principalship.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, CA.

Dougherty, M. C. (1978). *Becoming a woman in rural black culture.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Eddy, E. M. (1969). *Becoming a Teacher: The passage to professional status.* Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Gennep, A. van (1960). *The rites of passage.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gould, R. (1978). *Transformations.* New York. Simon & Schuster.

Hall, D. T. (1968). Identity changes during the transition from student to Professor. *The School Review, 6*(4), 445-469.

Iannaccone, L., & Button, H.W. (1964). *Functions of student teaching: Attitude formation and initiation in elementary student teaching.* Cooperative Research Project No. 1026, Office of Education, U.S. Department of HEW.

Jones, A.D. & Dougherty, C. (1982). Childbirth in a scientific and industrial society. In C.P. MacCormack (ed.) *Ethnography of Fertility and Birth.* (269-290). San Francisco: Academic Press.

Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *Invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Levinson, D. (1974). The psychological development of men in early adulthood and the mid-life transition. (article) Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Marshall, C. (1979). *Career socialization of women in school administration.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.

Marshall, C. (1981) Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. *Urban Education, 16*(2), 205-231.

Mascaro, F. G. (1973). *The early on-the-job socialization of first-year elementary school principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside, CA.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure.* New York: Free Press.

Murphy, M. D. (1984). Coming of age in Seville: The structuring of a riteless passage to manhood. *Journal of Anthropological Research, 39,* 376-392.

Oritz, F. I. (1972). *The process of professional incorporation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Ronkowski, S. A. (1985). Organizational entry experiences: Factors affecting first year doctoral students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*(2), DA8609710.

Schien, E. H. (1968). Organizational socialization and the profession of management. *Industrial Management Review, 9,* 1-15.

Schrier, D., & Mulcahy, D. F. (1988). Middle management and union realities: Coercion and anti-structure in a public corporation. *Human Organization, 47,* 146-151.

Sheehy, G. (1974). *Passages.* New York. Bantam.

Siggins, L.D., (1983) "Psychoanalysis and ritual." *Psychiatry, 46,* 2-15.

Valverde, L. A. (1974). *Succession socialization: Its influence on school administrative candidates and its implication to the exclusion of minorities from administration.* Final Report, NIE Project No. 3-0813.

White, M. (1986). Negative explanation, restraint, and dourble description: A template for family therapy. *Family Process, 25,* 169-184.

Wroblewski, S. S. (1987) *The doctor-nurse game: Inferred role reversal norms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.

Yunker, R. (1977). *Police field training: The analysis of a socialization process.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.